



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

✓

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,590	03/25/2004	Susann Marie Keohane	AUS920030951US1	7127
43307 IBM CORP (AP) C/O AMY PATTILLO P. O. BOX 161327 AUSTIN, TX 78716	7590 09/18/2007		EXAMINER WANG, LIANG CHE A	
			ART UNIT 2155	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/809,590	KEOHANE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Liang-che Alex Wang	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/25/04.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Paper Submitted

2. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file:
 - a. **Information Disclosure Statements** as received on 03/25/2004 is considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haneda et al., US Patent Number 6,189,027, hereinafter Haneda, in views of Seifert, US Publication Number 2004/0068543 A1, hereinafter Seifert.
5. Referring to claim 1, Haneda teaches a method for controlling received electronic message storage (Col 1 lines 50-56) comprising:
 - a. receiving a message with sender identification (email sender) at a messaging client controlling storage (host computer 1)(figure 1, Col 3 lines 15-22, incoming emails are stored at host computer 1 before delivering to terminal 2 of the

intended recipient) of a plurality of messages for an intended recipient (terminal 2) in a message storage system (figure 1);

- b. detecting a usage percentage of a capacity of said message storage system (Col 2 lines 23-28, available memory capacity of terminal 2 is detected, in a condition when the available memory capacity is zero, the usage percentage is also zero);
- c. comparing said sender identifier and said usage percentage with at least one criteria for blocking messages (Col 3 lines 23-28, the total volume of mail is compared with the available memory capacity, if there is no enough space for all the mails, then blocks emails with lower priority corresponds to “a least one criteria for blocking messages); and
- d. responsive to said sender identifier at said usage percentage meeting said criteria for blocking, blocking said message from said message storage system (Col 3 lines 23-28, the total volume of mail is compared with the available memory capacity, if there is no enough space for all the mails, then blocks emails with lower priority), such that blocking preferences which are implemented by said messaging client to avoid exceeding storage capacity with unread messages (Col 1 lines 50-53, Col 2 lines 8-12).

Haneda does not teach wherein said intended recipient is enabled to specify blocking preferences.

Seifert teaches the intended recipient can define blocking preferences for incoming emails (abstract, Page 1 [0011] lines 1-6, page 2 [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow recipient to specify blocking preferences for incoming emails because Haneda teaches a email system that has block preferences to block emails to ensure receipt of urgent and important mails (Col 1 lines 43-48), and Seifert suggests the recipient can define criteria for acceptable incoming emails (abstract, Page 1 [0011] lines 1-6, page 2 [0015]).

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Haneda because having the users to define email filtering/blocking rules would allow email recipients eliminate the transmission and/or receipt of unwanted emails (page 1 [0004]).

6. Referring to claim 2, Haneda teaches the method according to claim 1 for controlling received electronic message storage, wherein detecting a usage percentage further comprises: detecting said usage percentage of said capacity of said message storage system, wherein said message storage system is a folder from among a plurality of folders for storing messages in said message storage system (figure 3, storage 16).
7. Referring to claim 3, Haneda teaches the method according to claim 1 for controlling received electronic message storage, wherein receiving a message with sender identification further comprises: receiving an electronic mail message wherein said sender identification comprises an electronic mail address (Col 3 lines 15-16).
8. Referring to claim 4, Haneda teaches the method according to claim 1 for controlling received electronic message storage, wherein comparing said sender identifier and said usage percentage with said at least one criteria further comprises: comparing said sender

identifier with a plurality of sender identifiers each designated by said intended recipient to be blocked when a particular usage percentage is reached (Col 3 lines 18-20, Col 7 lines 32-40, lower priority emails are blocked when the available memory are reaching one hundred percent).

9. Referring to claim 5, Haneda teaches the method according to claim 1 for controlling received electronic message storage, wherein comparing said sender identifier and said usage percentage with said at least one criteria further comprises: comparing said sender identifier with a plurality of sender identifiers each designated to be excepted from blocking when a particular usage percentage is reached (Col 2 lines 8-12).
10. Referring to claim 6, Haneda teaches the method according to claim 1 for controlling received electronic message storage, further comprising: controlling an interface for said intended recipient to specify said at least one criteria (Seifert, abstract, Page 1 [0011] lines 1-6, page 2 [0015]).
11. Referring to claims 7-18 claims 7-18 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1-6. Therefore, claims 7-18 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-6.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by

the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (571)272-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.
14. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Liang-che Alex Wang
September 13, 2007

Liang Wang